



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

decendent Barber from its station to the Pennsylvania station. Because the original ticket contained no coupon for inter-station transfer and the initial carrier paid the compensation for such transfer, the limitation in the original ticket that the "company was not responsible beyond its own lines" could not exempt the company from liability for the negligence of the inter-station transfer company's driver. Similarly, in *Buffett v. Troy & B. R. Co.*, 40 N. Y. 168, where the railway hired a stage coach to bring its intending passengers from the village to the depot, the railway was held liable for the stage driver's negligence. And a hotel keeper, who furnished a bus to carry his guests without charge from the station to the hotel, was held liable for injuries to a guest resulting from the negligence of the driver, *Barker v. Pollock*, 26 Can. L. T. 182.

CARRIERS—SUFFICIENCY OF NOTICE OF LOSS—WAIVER.—Carloads of berries shipped over defendant's road were received in damaged condition and examined by defendant's agent in company with the consignee. An inspection report was made by the agent as well as a notation on the freight receipt, of the extent of the damage. After such examination plaintiff sent to defendant a written notice reading "Consignee will file a claim" etc. *Held*, that such notice, though in the future tense, was sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the uniform bill of lading approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission that claims for loss or damages be made in writing within four months. Further such a proviso was waived by defendant's action in conducting negotiations anent the claim without other formal notice. *E. H. Emery & Co. v. Wabash R. Co.*, (Iowa, 1918), 166 N. W. 600.

The instant case is an illustration of the courts' tendency to consider the spirit rather than the letter of the law on the subject of interstate commerce, and more particularly in the construction of the uniform bill of lading, providing for a written claim within a stated period. Substantial compliance has been repeatedly upheld. For example a telegram announcing consignee's intention to sue was deemed sufficient in *Georgia, Fla., & Ala. R. R. v. Blish Milling Co.*, 241 U. S. 190; and *Shark v. Great Northern Ry. Co.*, 164 N. W. 39 (N. D.) so considered an oral claim acted upon by the company, as did *So. Pac. Ry. v. Stewart*, 233 Fed. 956. Though the bill of lading expressly directed such notice to be given to a specified agent, a letter to a different agent was held effective in *Ill. Central R. R. v. Bauer*, 114 Miss. 516. In view of the court's decision as to the sufficiency of the notice, the question of waiver becomes unimportant. The state courts are inclined to allow such waiver; see *Cleveland, C. C. & St. L. R. Co. v. Rudy*, 173 Ind. 181, *Gilliland v. So. R. Co.*, 85 S. C. 26 and *Watkins Mdse. Co. v. Mo., Kan., and Texas R. Co.*, 82 Kan. 308. However when the question has been touched upon in the United States Courts, they have declared against waiver as tending to discrimination and thus repugnant to the spirit of the Interstate Commerce Commission Acts. It should be observed that these utterances are largely *dicta*, and are directed towards attempted waivers which will release the carrier, rather than the shipper, from liability. *Cf.* the *Blish* case *supra* and *Mo., Kn. and Tex. R. Co. v. Ward*, 37 Sup. Court 617.